



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

upon the patriarchal system will be glad to find here (p. 149) a complete statement of his argument against Sir Henry Maine. Another extremely valuable point in comparative jurisprudence is that on page 123, where it is shown that, in strong contrast to the principles of Roman law, "the wife is not regarded as kin to her husband's kin"; so that the two family groups recognized in Anglo-Saxon law — the *maegth* and the household — are properly kept distinct; the household (containing the wife) was not a portion of the *maegth* or kindred. The nature of the contract of marriage is discussed with great acuteness, and especial emphasis is laid (p. 169) upon the way in which this is affected by the ethical character of marriage. An Appendix of eighty-five pages contains thirty-five "Select Cases in Anglo-Saxon Law," in Latin and Anglo-Saxon, with translations and introductions.

10. — *Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge.* By JAMES THOMPSON BIXBY. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1877. 12mo. pp. 226.

THE purpose of Mr. Bixby's book is to prove that there is no "necessary antagonism between science and religion." Science is "that portion of systematized and certain knowledge which can be gained by a study of the physical universe." Religion is composed of three beliefs: "Belief in a soul within man; belief in a sovereign Over-soul without; belief in actual or possible relations between them." To prove his proposition, Mr. Bixby attempts to show that religion and science use identical methods. Intuition, belief, authority, analogy, and the other recognized methods of religion are likewise employed by science. Sense-observation, induction, verification, and the other recognized methods of science are likewise employed by religion. Religion and science are subject, moreover, to similar limitations. Scientific theories are mere hypotheses, and their truth cannot be proved. Religious doctrines are spun out of man's brain and vary with degrees of latitude.

Such is the barest outline of Mr. Bixby's argument. If he intended to prove that there is no necessary antagonism between science and religion, as he has defined them, he has succeeded in proving what very few, if any, have succeeded in doubting. Who has been so bold as to say that an antagonism must exist between the hypotheses of science and the belief in the existence of one's own soul, of an Over-soul, and of relations between them? Professor Tyndall may deny the existence of an Over-soul; but does his science compel him to this denial? A man who never heard of polarized light may deny the evi-

dence of an Over-soul; but is there any theory of science which compels him to reject the simple religion which Mr. Bixby presents? We believe there is none. If, on the other hand, by religion Mr. Bixby means Christianity, and if he intends to prove that there is no necessary antagonism between science and Christianity, he has, we regret to say, signally failed; for no one would accept his definition of religion as a definition of the religion of Christ. Like Hegel's "pure Being" it includes every type of religion. But these fundamental defects of definition are followed by numerous minor faults of logic and philosophy. The long argument intended to prove that science as well as religion is concerned with "the immaterial," is rendered totally useless by a failure to define "the immaterial." To Berkeley an idea is the most material thing, to Hamilton it is the least material. Whom does Mr. Bixby follow? The attempt, also, to show that the existence of a First Cause can be proved by induction utterly fails, as would be expected. Kant, nearly a hundred years ago, in the Third Antinomy of the "Critique," conclusively demonstrated the uselessness of all such attempts.

But notwithstanding these radical faults of definition and philosophy, the author points out with not a little power of discrimination the similarities of science and of what he calls religion, and indicates with excellent taste, the consequent foolhardiness of the endeavor of either to condemn the other at its bar. The spirit in which the book is written is to be commended to new-school scientists and to old-school theologians. The author's theological training has not prejudiced him against science, and his proficiency in what may be called the philosophy of science has evidently not lessened his reverence for either Moses or St. Paul. The style usually calm and judicial rises in certain passages to a considerable degree of energy, but sinks in others into a metaphorical gaudiness unbecoming the treatment of any subject, and especially of a philosophical one. The author has a fondness for coining words, as "hypotheticalness" (p. 143), "idealness" (p. 134), "*high-priori*" (p. 68). This propensity should be severely curbed.

-
11. — *Troubadours and Trouvères, New and Old*. By HARRIET W. PRESTON. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1876. 16mo.

MISS PRESTON is favorably known as the translator of Mistral's *Mirèio*, which first made the American public acquainted with the modern Provençal school of poets. The first impulse to the formation of this school was given by Jasmin, whose "*Blind Girl of Castèl-Cuillè*" is well known